DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 089 635 HE 005 387

AUTHOR Crookston, Burns B.
TITLE Student Development and Involvement in Governance.
PUB DATE 27 Mar 74
NOTE 32p.; Keynote address at the 51st conference Association of College Unions-International (Toronto, Canada, March 27, 1974)

EDRS PRICE MF-$0.75 HC-$1.85 PLUS POSTAGE
DESCRIPTORS *Cocurricular Activities; Colleges; Community Colleges; Educational Administration; *Facility Planning; Governance; *Higher Education; Junior Colleges; *Planning (Facilities); *Student Organizations; Student Participation; Student School Relationship; *Student Unions; Universities

ABSTRACT

There has been a general decline in college unions in the past few years. The author suggests some external and internal factors that have a significant bearing on the general state of unions: substantial reforms in teaching, changes in college counseling centers, transformations in residence halls, and development of student subcultures off-campus. The internal factors are: paternalism, encapsulation, and preoccupation with management. The author attempts to relate these factors to a discussion of human development philosophy and methodology in comparison with union goals. Finally he gives emphasis to the relationship of governance to the development of effective citizens in a democracy as a critical educational function of the union. (Author/PG)

ED 089635

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

STUDENT DEVELOPMENT AND INVOLVEMENT IN GOVERNANCE

Burns B. Crookston

University of Connecticut

U S DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

HE 005 387

Keynote Address

FIFTY-FIRST ANNUAL CONFERENCE

ASSOCIATION OF COLLEGE UNIONS - INTERNATIONAL

Toronto, Canada

March 27, 1974

STUDENT DEVELOPMENT AND INVOLVEMENT IN GOVERNANCE

Burns B. Crookston
University of Connecticut

To set the stage for my remarks this morning I would like to share with you an exchange that took place between your conference chairman Ron Loomis and me. In expressing my pleasure in accepting the invitation to speak before the ACU-I Annual Conference, I wrote the following: "During the past two decades I have been closely associated with the governance, program, management and administration of the union of the University of Utah and Colorado State University. More recently, as an observer amicus curiae, I have noted with increasing apprehension what appears to be a decline in the union as a significant educational vehicle on a number of college and university campuses as perceived by both student and faculty observers." In response to this assertion Mr. Loomis replied that while there appears to the contrary to have been a rather significant increase in the educational significance of the union at a number of colleges and universities, my general apprehension about the general decline of unions in total impact is shared by a number of leaders in the college union field.

It is toward this concern that I wish to fasnion my remarks. I shall first suggest some external and internal factors that I believe have had a significant bearing on the general state of

unions. I shall attempt to relate these factors to a discussion of human development philosophy and methodology in comparison with union goals. I will argue that the attainment of the actualizing goals of both the union and human development cannot be attained unless the organization charged with the task of goal accomplishment is actualizing as well. Finally I will give some emphasis to the relationship of governance to the development of effective citizens in a democracy as a critical educational function of the union.

DECLINE OF THE UNION

We began these remarks by viewing with alarm what seems to have been a general decline of the union as a significant force on many college campuses. Let us review together some external, as well as internal factors which in varying degree appear to have contributed to the decline.

External factors

First of all, while much of it is as bad as ever, there have been substantial reforms in teaching. Much of the experimentation and innovation in teaching methodology that took place during the past decade has paid off in better quality, more creative teaching. Affective learning has achieved academic legitimacy. Teaching and learning now extend beyond the classroom, off-campus, into a wide range of settings. Thus much of the experimentation and reform that was spawned outside the classroom, a substantial part of which was in and around the union, has been

legitimized in the classroom and curriculum. Where students were formerly involved in meaningful learning outside the classroom, they now can get credit for a similar experience as an academic offering. Parralleling this reform in the classroom have been more effective programs offered through extension, continuing education, and other programs for adults in the community.

Second, there has been a radical change in many, if not most college counseling centers, from the remedial-medical model to a proactive, community mental health model, to comprehensive centers of student development. Extensive training programs ranging from the development of paraprofessionals and peer counselors to workshops on human sexuality, homosexuality and life planning to consultation services to the college community on evaluation and organization development. While these developments are to be applauded, undoubtedly they have drawn away customers who a decade earlier might well have been participating in similar efforts such as leadership and group training programs that were being pioneered by union staff and student program leaders.

Third, the transformation in college residence halls that began with the student revolt against institutional housing, followed by the phasing-out of in loco parentis and continuing at present with the development of a new breed of staff who have shed the old mantle of the monitor and administrative

control agent. Donning the new look of the catalyst, consultant, trainer, and facilitator, they are focusing student interest on building intentional communities, creating living-learning environments and other types of programs. All are having their impact in successfully competing with the union on the program front.

Fourth, along with the attempt to give meaning and substance to living on campus, there has developed a substantial student subculture off-campus. Some students went off campus to escape the sterile environment of institutional housing, others because of life-style or counter culture preferences, still others because of college policies and practices in dealing with the drug problem, and others for reasons related to economy. Where the union a decade ago was the hub of activity for off campus students, today they are more likely to meet such needs away from campus. (Curiously, on some campuses the reverse seems to be true, the union is becoming the headquarters for various subcultures, such as minority groups, gay alliances, and other special interest groups to the extent that some union staff are complaining the presence of such groups appears to be driving away many others.)

Fifth, in sharp contrast to the old union idea as a place to meet and engage in lively discourse, be it profound or light-hearted, we seem to be drifting into a consumer culture of passive participants, of watchers and waiters for something to

happen to us, or for something to be done for us. Some unions seem to be "programming" students instead of getting students actively involved in participating, creating, developing, and running programs. Could there be an inverse relationship between rise of "consumer" oriented programs and an apparent decline in active involvement?

Although these five factors, in my view, are probably the principle ones, any analysis of external forces affecting the union would no doubt include such other factors as the eighteen year vote, and the preoccupation of the young on achieving economic independence as the real proof of adulthood, and the size and diversification of college campuses that often has resulted in the union being perceived both physically and psychologically as away from the center of campus.

Internal factors

While it may be reassuring for us to look to external factors as the principle causes of some current difficulties, we know our analysis cannot be completed without examining some internal factors as well. No doubt each one of us has a list that can be readily called to mind. Let me share my list of the following four factors: policies that are administratively determined, paternalism, encapsulation and preoccupation with management.

First, policies that are administratively determined, or,

putting it another way, governance by bureaucracy, where the power flows from the top and the accountability emanates from the bottom of the hierarchy. The union board, if it exists at all in such an arrangement, is implicitly, if not explicitly advisory to the director. Even though this type of organization clearly flies in the face of the union tradition of student or academic community policy control, your own ACU-I studies indicate variations of it still persist on a number of campuses. Of course, many of us can recall this type of control was prompted in large measure at a number of institutions by economic and other factors external to the colleges during the depression years of the Thirties and the war years that immediately followed when financial disaster was averted only by administrative intervention, which, once established, was perpetuated. This lack of confidence in student control coupled with a mutual distrust that had already developed between students and administration helped solidify administrative control To these unions we should add some that have come into existence during the past decade which seem to be built upon the premise that they are not a community educational enterprise, but administrative services like financial aid, employment or placement offices, thus making moot the issue of policy-making as a function of union governance.

Administrative policy determination or veto prerogatives, of course, opens up the way for a variety of zero-sum (I win-you lose) games played by individuals or groups that inevitably wind-up as counterproductive for all parties concerned. One need not

look far on such campuses to find examples of some rather petty policy issues going all the way up the administration ladder to the president which need never happen in a system with a strong union governing board. It is difficult to conceive how any sense of member involvement or commitment to the union and its programs could obtain under such an administrative arrangement.

Second, paternalism. Even though the doctrine of in loco parentis may be legally dead and in de facto operation on the college campus, I believe we must admit it is very much alive in terms of the psychological and emotional climate that exists on a number of campuses as expressed in the attitudes and behavior of many faculty, administrators and staff. It takes far more than the passage of a law to change children to adults in the minds of many of us. It takes far more than administrative fiat to change an historic relationship defined in terms of status and control to one that must be redefined in terms of competence and collaboration. The power oriented administrator always has the security of a trump card: when reason, manipulation or persuasion won't work, then use power. When students know the power is there to be used they cease to relate to the person; they relate to the power the person represents. Take away the power and you take away the basis for the relationship. Once deprived of power, many student affairs administrators have taken on the stance of the benevolent father or mother figure, thus perpetuating the adult-child relationship with students, a relationship that can be expressed in a variety of ways. For

instance, if you are in my age range it is easy to adopt the father role. And if we can no longer impose sanctions we get our way by making the "child" feel guilty. We can perpetuate the relationship by maintaining status symbols - fancy offices and decor, by using secretaries to make ourselves relatively inaccessable to students but readily accessable to staff, by physically segregating staff offices from student offices, by conducting separate "professional" staff and student staff meetings, by planning to do things <u>for</u>, or <u>to</u> students rather than <u>with</u> them. By creating such illusions of authority we can thus re-enforce attitudes about authority that our authoritarian system of education has drilled into the student the previous twelve or more years. Thus we perpetuate the child-parent relationship. Some of us rationalize this type of behavior on the argument that the students really don't want to work with us as a team, that they want to remain separate. And there is no doubt ample evidence in student attitudes and behavior that would lend support to this argument. But while we hold out our hand in a bid for partnership with students and at the same time in our behavior continue to give out signals that say we are comfortable with a status-based relationship, it is predictable that the students, practiced in the art of picking up such behavioral cues, will come up with the alternative we in our self-fulfilling prophecy are relieved to settle for. Unfortunately the resultant bifurcated student-staff relationship is not conducive to the type of community toward which the goals

of the union are directed.

Third, encapsulation. Due to any one or a variety of reasons, some unions have become a sort of encapsulated enclave or island on campus, shut off from active reaching out to the rest of the campus, evidently being content to serve those customers who come through the doors, making facilities available as requested and providing program and staff assistance as needed. There is little communication with the rest of campus, including with other programs and services in student affairs. The union is internally self serving, concentrating on doing a first rate job of providing for needs as they are presented and working toward the development of students who participate in the programs. The stance is to be responsive and adaptive to changing campus needs and requirements, but not to go out looking for things to do or new worlds to conquer. The result is to increase the wall of encapsulation and decrease the size of student and faculty community that benefit from the union programs or services.

There is another aspect of separatism - the perpetuation of the historic distinction between classroom and non-classroom learning made not only by unions but by student personnel in general. The assumption for decades has been that since the faculty were "teaching" subjects inside the classroom student personnel workers were "educating" students as whole persons outside. Anything that sounded or smelled "academic" was not

allowed in the many unions. After all, let us recall the old idea of the union included the notion that it should be a retreat, a haven from the classroom. The past decade has done much to relegate this attitude to history. Formal academic learning no longer need be viewed as a necessary burden; it can be exciting, exhilarating and self-fulfilling. And it doesn't have to be relegated to the classroom. Unions which have not realized this fact are being passed by because the action is elsewhere.

The fourth factor that seems to have contributed to the decline of unions is what appears to be a preoccupation with management, often at the expense of program development. We are all aware of the increasing pressures from public bodies for fiscal accountability in higher education. There are many who believe that unions should be self supporting and should not require subsidization from the other college or university fund sources. These same individuals are far from convinced unions are anything more than an "auxiliary enterprise" for student fun and games and therefore should be paid for by the students, all the eloquent appeals by Porter Butts and his colleagues over the years to the contrary notwithstanding.

Now of course there can be no doubt that every union operation must be underscored by sound and prudent management. But any union director who spends more than a fourth time on management needs to look carefully at priorities. Unfortunately it is relatively easy to think in managerial terms. Salary

increases and other rewards are often based more on managerial skills than leadership in planning, program and policy, or, for that matter on successful union goal accomplishment. It is easier to control variables and to quantify management outputs for purposes of evaluation. Many of us have not yet learned how to develop a data base upon which the goal accomplishments in the far more elusive program and development areas can be quantified and measured, a problem, I might add, that is shared by many academicians who are still struggling for a more defensible measure of effective teaching than letter grades and credit hour production. Like the teachers, union professional and student staff must come up with a better measure of job performance and goal accomplishment. It is clear that those who sit in judgement will not unless we give them the necessary tools. The burden is on union staff to establish realistic evaluative criteria if they wish to change a reward system based on management criteria.

With this enumeration of circumstances external and internal with which the union must contend as a back drop, let us now proceed with the central thrust of our remarks: a consideration of the concept of student development and its implications for governance, specifically in relation to the union.

THE CONCEPT OF HUMAN DEVELOPMENT*

Most of us are familiar with the chain of events and

*For a more extensive development of this concept by the author see the appended list of writings.

circumstances of the past decade which have led us to shift our focus to student development, and, more recently, human development. While to some, such a change in terminology is merely a stylish window dressing for little more than as up-dated version of what we have been doing under the old student personnel rubric, to most of us, I believe, it means a rather significant shift in philosophy and a dramatic exchange in methodology. Human development refers to the knowledge, conditions, and processes that contribute to the growth, development, and fulfillment of the individual throughout life as a realized person and effective, productive citizen and which also contribute to the growth and development of a democratic society. Student development is the application of human development in the college setting; hence student development is time-based to a period of life while human development deals with the whole of life. Student development as an operating concept is also more limited in that it focuses on the student. Human development focuses on every body in the college community - students, faculty, administration, staff and others.

The philosophical foundation of human development is not new; it is a substantial restatement of goals of general education which aim toward the all around development and actualization of the individual, and which facilitates the growth and development of a democratic society. Human development has come into being because higher education

has failed to deliver in accomplishing the goals of general education. The principle contributing factor to this failure was methodological - in not knowing how to apply human development teaching concepts that place the student in the center of the curriculum. Human development focuses not on subject matter requirements and syllabi, but on the student and his world. Human development is taught, not by fitting the student into a cultural heritage, but by teaching students the processes of discovering what is known and applying that knowledge to a deeper understanding of self, of enhancing the quality of relationships with others and coping effectively with their world.

The methodology of human development is based on the belief that for life to have meaning and purpose it must be examined by the person who must live it. This process of examination should include areas of inquiry, growth, experience, analysis, and personal synthesis that would examine a seemingly endless list of questions, beginning with: Who am I? Why am I here? and, Where am I going? In relation to each of such questions there would emerge by means of self study and interaction with teachers, a systematic series of developmental tasks that lead to definition of self, further inquiry, analysis, synthesis of a redefinition of self, and so on.

The teaching of human development includes any experience in which a teacher interacts with students as individuals, or in groups that contributes to individual, group, or community growth

and development, and can be evaluated. The teaching-learning transaction can take place anywhere. The teacher can be anyone in the community, the "student" can be anyone in the community. In short, under human development the old classroom-extracurricular dichotomy that has so long characterized higher education in general and student affairs (the union included) in particular must come to an end. The entire college community and the community beyond is now the learning environment in which teaching and learning can take place, whether it produce academic credit or not; hence, the teacher of human development teaches in multiple situations, including the classroom. By this definition the human development teacher is as likely to be found in the union program office as the department of psychology or philosophy.

UNION OBJECTIVES

This brief review of the concept of human development no doubt has elicited in many of us the question: Does it jibe with the objectives of the college union? History tells us the union idea began when students wanted a way and a place to express themselves that was not afforded within the existing academic program. The most recent statement of objectives adopted by ACU-I in 1956 contain four ideas: 1) The union is the center of the college community and as such promotes the idea of community, 2) The union is the living room for the college family, 3) As a part of the educational program of the college the union is a laboratory of citizenship, training

students in social responsibility and for leadership in our democracy, and 4) The union unifies the college and promotes loyalty to it. A cursory examination of these objectives would suggest high philosophical compatability with the concepts of human development. Only the second objective, the cherished campus family hearthstone idea, appears conspicuously incongruent, not only with human development, but with other union objectives, particularly with the campus community idea. The "campus family" takes us back to the benevolent paternalism of the in loco parentis era, in which the administration and faculty were the parents and the students the children. The community concept on the other hand is equalitarian and goes hand in hand with the idea developing effective citizens.

The third union objective further states: "In all its processes it (the union) encourages self-directed activity, giving maximum opportunity for self-realization and for growth in individual social competency and group effectiveness. Its goal is the development of persons as well as intellects." Now this statement further reinforces the idea of high congruence with the tenets of human development, except for the last phrase, "the development of persons as well as intellects", which, I am afraid, betrays a way of thinking about higher education that is one of the great paradoxes in the history of the student personnel era (which I believe has come, or most certainly is coming to a close). While we as a field had subscribed to the

philosophy of general education, which W. H. Cowley called "holism" - educating the whole person - in practice we have until very recently been what Harold Taylor called neo-humanistic - we separated the mind from body, thought from feeling, reason from action. We knew our academic colleagues were concerned almost exclusively with the intellect. Some of us tried to get the faculty to teach the student as a whole person. Failing in this endeavor we had to settle for "educating" the student outside the classroom while the faculty was "teaching" inside. When the student rather than the subject becomes the focus for teaching and learning such a dichotomy should cease to exist.

But that is another story for another time. Much has happened in the nearly two decades since the ACU-I statement was adopted. Here we must hurry on to a consideration of how the concept of human development can be applied in the Union with particular emphasis given to the question of governance.

ELEMENTS OF AN ACTUALIZING ORGANIZATION

Stating our definition of human development another way, the focus is twofold: 1) on the actualization of the individual, and 2) on the actualization of society. <u>It becomes obvious we cannot achieve these ends unless we also have actualizing organizations</u>. If we have learned nothing else from the decade of the Sixties I hope we have learned we can no longer perpetuate the authoritarian hypocrisy, both in and outside the classroom, of saying to the student in effect, "Don't do as I do; do as I say."

The teacher cannot teach democracy by preaching it and then telling the students to practice it later. Staff cannot teach democracy in residence halls when the halls in fact are run as authoritarian bureaucracies. This is nothing more than the old end-justifies-the-means aristocratic philosophy. In human development the ends are the means.

What then are the elements of an actualizing organization? There are Three. It must be symbiotic. It must be democratic. It must be self renewing.

Symbiotic

An actualizing organization is one in which the individual and group needs and goals are symbiotic; that is, mutually growth producing. As the individual contributes to the needs and goals of the group, the group in turn meets member needs and fosters goal achievement. This symbiotic transaction is articulated by means of a negotiated agreement between the individual and the organization called a developmental contract by which each individual shares in the development of a plan that permits the individual to grow and develop as a person (and as a professional) while at the same time the group is meeting its goals through optimal use of the talent, skill and energy of the individual. These agreements between the member and the group are articulated at time intervals that mark the completion and evaluation of a project, task or learning segment. As new group goals and priorities are set an individual re-assessment is also made.

Through a process of negotiation individual and group goal and need requirements are meshed and the developmental contract for the new period is completed. As goals and tasks are accomplished a new re-assessment is made and the process is repeated.

Democratic

One of the great paradoxes of American democracy is that while a primary goal of education is to teach the citizen how to function effectively in a democracy, in actuality we spend most of our lives, not in democratic, but within bureaucratic or other authoritarian structures and organizations. The growing child learns early to channel the satisfaction of needs in compliance with a system of rewards and punishments set forth by authority figures. Thanks to the persistence of the folklore and fantasy of Prince Charming, of good kings and bad kings, the value system of the growing child is often built around the acceptance of the authoritarian concept of a world of rulers and ruled as consonant with the nature of things. This authoritarianism is re-enforced in school systems run as bureaucracies and taught by teachers using authoritarian teaching methods. It is also re-enforced within those religions based on the orthodoxy of undoubting obedience to higher authority.

In the face of all this we still persist in the naive myth that democracy itself is a natural endowment anybody can enjoy and a game anybody can play. The truth is that despite the pleading that began with Jefferson our system of education has provided

the people with neither an adequate understanding of democracy nor an adequate training in applying concepts effectively as citizens. Our formal training in democracy is often limited to being taught something of how our system of government works, the importance of voting and being informed on both the candidates and the issues, the rightness of majority rule and the rudiments of parliamentary procedure. But few indeed are taught how to function effectively in those basic units that comprise the heart and soul of democracy, the small group or community.

The wholesale failure of so-called participatory democracies of the late Sixties has made many of us realize it takes far more than people, idealism and good will to make a democratic community work, utopian or otherwise. It takes training, competence, hard work, perseverance, responsibility and commitment to produce individuals and groups capable of successful democratic self-government.

The miracle of it all is that somehow our democracy as a system has been able to survive in spite of enormous inefficiency and incompetence. But this good luck has been abetted by two centuries of geographical insularity and seemingly endless abundance that have permitted such extravagances. It is clear we are now in a period in our history when such luxuries no longer exist. Time is running out for us to continue to play games with such a priceless heritage.

Let us recall that one of the goals of human development

and of the union is to produce citizens who contribute to the growth and development of a democratic society. Keeping in mind that in human development the ends are the means, we can hardly achieve this goal unless we function democratically. In order to achieve symbiosis between the individual members and the organization there must be member participation at all levels in the extablishment of goals, priorities and policies. By this we do not mean that all decisions must be made by the group, a common misperception of many of the socalled participative democracies of the late Sixties; nor that a group functions best without a formal leader; nor that all decisions are made by majority vote. What we do mean by a democratic group can best be understood in locating the sources of power and how the uses of power become authorized. In a democracy the source of all power is derived from each member who, in theory at least, possesses the same power as any other member. To form a union each member gives a portion of his power to the group for the purpose of establishing an organization which is authorized by the members to utilize the power given to achieve the goals and promote the general welfare of the group. All other powers not specifically given are retained by the individual members. This giving of power by each member, along with an act of commitment to support, sustain, promote the welfare of the group and abide by the decisions made is called a social contract.

To no one's surprise, what we have just described is the process by which the democratic state is created. The same process is repeated to form any democratic subgroup, but in this latter

case, in addition to the social contract in which power is derived from the members, there must also be a charter by which the group is authorized to function by a higher authority. Thus, if the college union, as a subgroup of the college, is to be democratically conceived, it gets power from its members and authorization to function from the college power source, the trustees. A democratically conceived Union Board, therefore, is created by its membership and authorized to function by the college trustees within whatever parameters as are included in the charter. Hence, the union Board is both accountable to the trustees and answerable to its members.

If the union on the other hand is created by the college trustees and authorized to function with or without a Union Board it is not a democratic organization, regardless of what its constitution says. It is an agency created by the college in much the same way as the college is an agency of the state or of a corporation. As such it is accountable to its only power source, the trustees, and not answerable to whatever clientele the board of trustees determines to be the members of the union.

It is this very reason why a Union Board that is advisory to the director is unlikely to work sucessfully in the long run, because it is accountable only to higher authority and not answerable to a constituent body. An advisory board is, after all, an administrative creation, not a creation of the union membership itself.

Does this principle of answerability mean the Union Board

must be elected? That is certainly a logical possibility. But there are difficulties with that notion, the principal of which is the tendency for the central purposes of the union to become subverted to the political aspirations of the power hungry. This difficulty may be overcome in large measure by establishing qualifications for those who are eligible for service on the board whether elected or appointed.

However the the members of the union governing board are chosen, what is critical to our discussion at this point is that a means must be found by which the constituency served by the board can be involved in one way or another in the policy formation and program development processes of the union. To fail to establish this crucial connection with the members served is to fail ultimately in serving both the goals of the union and of human development. The union is at once a human service and a part of an educational program. Regardless of how nobly motivated the board and staff may be, if the union is only administratively accountable and not constituently answerable, even when human service and human development are given the highest priority, ultimately the bureaucratic priorities -- those things that are done that accommodate the convenience and efficiency needs of the staff and the organization and often at the expense of the clientele -- will prevail. We need only look around us to find legion examples. For instance, this phenomenon struck me with particular force after I had switched from principal student affairs officer to professor. As dean I had enjoyed for years the luxury of secretaries and junior staff running interference for me in

negotiating the bureaucracy to get things done. When good manners, reason, guile or wile failed to work they used the clout of the office (an action to which I was more often than not totally oblivious.) As a professor I had none of these protections. I had (and still have to) to deal directly with all sorts of low-level bureaucratic functionaries, from trying to get textbooks through the bookstore to walking travel authorizations through several offices, to getting a work-study student from the financial aid office. I discovered forthwith how efficiently my own student affairs organization had so long shielded me from such horrors. The people who work for these organizations, regardless of their good intentions and explicit mission to serve people, in the final analysis end up serving their own organizations. They operate, not by reason, but by rules, not by what the clientele need, but what the system demands or permits. This is what inevitably happens when one is accountable to a hierarchy, but not answerable to a constituency. <u>The Union Board, as imperfect as it may be, must be answerable to a constituency</u>. The task is to invent ways for this answerability to function in practice.

This principal of answerability as an essential component of an actualizing organization, holds not only for the union but for other parts of the college -- in counseling centers, residence halls, in the classroom, even in the president's office. Any organization concerned with human development must have the means for direct feedback and other forms of participation in goals re-assessment and policy reformulation from those being served.

It is this principal of answerability that makes me uneasy with the self-perpetuation procedure that is common in replacing student members to the Union Board, in which the new members are selected by the old. This procedure feeds the very human tendency we all have to selecting others like ourselves, who share our ideas and views and with whom we are most comfortable. Thus, regardless of our best intentions, we tend to remake the board in our own image. It is this procedure that also makes the board in general and the staff in particular vulnerable to charges that student leaders are being co-opted into a ruling oligarchy of faculty and administrative staff.

The principal of answerability as an essential component of the character of a democratic union is closely related to the third ingredient in an actualizing organization: it must be self renewing.

Self Renewing

An actualizing organization should be in a continual state of self renewal, not only as a response to inevitable change, but also in planning for change and systematically bringing it about. In addition to a process of goal reassessment at regular intervals there should be regular turnover in leadership and membership. Leadership functions should be goal oriented, functional and utilitarian, not occupational or a prestige symbol.

In a rapidly changing society of temporary social systems the nostalgia of relatively permanent or life-long group relationships of the past are likely to become increasingly rare. The individual must learn to enter new groups quickly, have the sensi-

tivity to establish relationships that are helpful to self and others, and the skill to assist the group toward goal accomplishment before moving to another group to repeat the process. In a college community the turnover of students of course is automatic. The union as a human development organization, conceivably designed to be a center for self renewal for the entire campus, should also have faculty and staff membership from various sectors of the institution shifting in and out of the organization. In this way, not only will the leadership and membership of an actualizing organization systematically change, but as a consequence the organization itself would change in accordance with the nature of the goals, the resources of its membership, and other changing circumstances. Thus, in contrast to a bureaucracy where the tasks are often modified to accommodate the convenience of the existing organization, the resources of the group should be mobilized around goals and specific task accomplishment. Many such groups will self-destruct when they complete a given task. New groups are formed in accordance with the nature of the new task.

If we are serious about making this human development concept work we will have to depart dramatically from the present bureaucratic status hierarchy organization in which "success" is always measured as "up and out", where the Peter Principle operates to "kick upstairs" a designated leader whose time has come to a position of pseudostatus where the leader's skill and talents are wasted, and where "stepping down" is synonymous with failure. This means we must stop training and gearing our staff

to be career administrators. Instead we train them to be professionals in human development knowledge and technologies: as teachers, catylsts, counselors, consultants, trainers, researchers. Formal leadership positions should be on the basis of term, renewable perhaps, but depending on the goals of the designated leader, of the organization, and the evaluation of the leader's performance by the organization. Academicians have been functioning in and out of leadership positions on the college campus for years. There appears to be a current trend of appointing college presidents on the basis of terms. Such changing of leadership in accordance with changing goals and tasks within an organization would be facilitated by the existance of an organization development unit (which could be part of a human development center) which can facilitate changes of leadership through appropriate training and consultation. Such a system obviously will not work as long as the "up and out" status hierarchy system of career administrators is perpetuated. It will work when the system is changed and competent professionals are hired who are regarded for expertise and effectiveness whether in the capacity of formal leader or human development educator Of course the kicker in all this is that these professionals must be given the same guarantees of promotion and job security as other members of the faculty.

Another self-renewing function has to do with the development of a sense of community in the union membership. Each year new students enter the college as automatic members of the union with a certain amount of their fees allocated in support of the union and its programs. Our knowledge of social psychology tells

us that since these new members had nothing to do with the social contract that created the union it is highly unlikely they will feel any significant identification with the union or its programs. But if they, along with continuing members are provided with the self renewing opportunity to participate in the renegotiation or reaffirmation of the social contract, such participation in and of itself is likely to greatly increase the chances for these new members to identify with the Union and develop a sense of commitment to it and its goals. Such a periodic renegotiation of the social contract also can have the salutory effect of unfreezing the organization and making possible the development of new emphases to meet the needs of new members who in the process of renegotiation can make their needs known.

Depending upon the extent of revision in the social contract that might result from such a process of renegotiation, it might as a consequence be necessary to renegotiate the union charter with the college trustees as new circumstances may warrant. Such a periodic transaction with the trustees can also have the salutory effect of revivifying interest in the union program and functions in the public eye of the larger community.

Over the years many of us have felt that periodic review of student constitutions, while often tedious, was an important learning experience for students in discovering the way governance works. But it is more than that. It is the way any of us who come into any pre-established human group or community are able to become a part of the whole. If we have a chance to

participate in the re-negotiation or re-affirmation of the social contract we can commit ourselves to the group. Otherwise we never feel a sense of ownership. This is why the process of self-renewal is so critical.

SOME PARTING SHOTS

As I reviewed these remarks and realized the development of these concepts alone would occupy more time than what could possibly be alloted me, I was confronted with the sinking feeling that there is still an enormous list of important things I want to say to you. Recalling that it has been thirteen years since the last time I gave a talk to ACU-I, and suddenly realizing it may well be another thirteen years, if ever, that I might be given another opportunity I hope you will forgive me for taking a few quick parting shots that are too important to wait for another time:

1. Volunteerism. The development and expansion of volunteer programs on campus and in the community is one of the great contributions the union can make in developing competent, dedicated citizens in a democracy. Our country and other nations are slowly but inevitably coming to the realization that the problems of society can never be accomplished by taxation and governmental agencies alone; it takes people, giving of their talent, their labor and their selves that will make the difference. It is this very same giving of self to the community that is the

essence of the issue of effective governance. It is the volunteer through whom the principle of answerability will work. These volunteers need training and their efforts need coordination. The union is ideally equipped to help do both.

2. Student leadership continuity. A perennial problem. Two suggestions: Why not encourage top student leadership, both volunteer and employed to take a year or two leave of absence from study to concentrate on the union? The old myth that nothing should stand in the way of a student continuing to make "normal progress toward graduation" in four years has at last been exploded. There are clearly other student priorities. Why shouldn't the union be one of them? The second suggestion is to make volunteer work in and outside the union a legitimate, credit producing academic learning experience. It is also a way to get faculty supervising such coursework involved with the union.

3. Getting faculty involved. I am becoming increasingly convinced that aside from recreation the only systematic way of getting faculty involved is through the human development model in which the union can be viewed as a classroom.

4. The union as a center for human development. At the ACU-I meeting about eight years ago Earl Koile was ahead of his time when he suggested the union could become a learning community center where students and faculty could take the initiative in developing a number of educational programs, where the college

as an agency of change could be brought to bear on the campus community and where the student center programs become learning laboratories for faculty and students. It might well be that the time for that idea has finally come. As the oldest model of programs and services under student policy control in modern education, the union could well be the prototype for a center for human development, particularly in view of what appears to to be a clear trend toward greater student policy control of other student programs and services. Many counseling centers have been moving into the human development model, but they have an historical image of being the "shrink center" that is difficult to shed, and they do not always enjoy the relative semi-autonomy from administrative control that would make the Union more ideally suited to become the center. Should other student programs and services also be housed in the union as a center for human development? We know a number of them are around the country. In any event, the idea deserves serious consideration. It may well be the wave of the future.

RECENT WRITINGS ON HUMAN DEVELOPMENT THEMES BY BURNS B. CROOKSTON

An Organizational Model for Student Development. Proceedings: Northwest College Personnel Association, Annual Meeting, Gearhart, Oregon, October, 1970, 29 p.

A Developmental View of Academic Advising as Teaching, Journal of College Student Personnel. 1972, 13, 12-17.

An Organizational Model for Student Development. NASPA Journal, 1972, 10, 3-13.

Education for Human Development. In Warnath, Charles F. and Associates, New Directions for College Counselors. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1973, Chapter 2, 47-65.

New Organizations to Fulfill Human Development Goals. Presented at the Twenty-Third Meeting of the Annual Institute on College Student Personnel Work, Minneapolis, February, 1973, 27 p.

Organizational Structure and Human Development. Presented at the Annual Conference of the National Association of Student Personnel Administrators, Philadelphia, April, 1973, 13 p.

Human Development and Effective Management Practices: Are They Compatible? Presented at NASPA Regional Conference, Durham, New Hampshire, November, 1973, 16 p.

The Intentional Democratic Community in College Residence Halls. Personnel and Guidance Journal, 1974, 52, 382-389.